

9/25/70

Dear Dean,

It may not have occurred to you, but Justice is an abstract with me. Good and bad doesn't enter into it and nobody has it unless everybody has it.

On the other hand, I don't for a minute think lawyers really believe everything they say. So, I do not know whether you and/or your associates are serious about the Ferrie bit I've just read about in the N.O. papers.

If you are, perhaps I have some information that can help you. And I'm about to file a suit against the Justice Department for what they are withholding on Ferrie. This is by no means an impossibility. I won the first such case. Incredibly, I got a summary judgement. They have until the 26th of next month to respond to the second one I filed. I've forgotten how long they have on the third.

And I've asked a federal judge to do something about their perjury in the first case. He hasn't been anxious to reply. Maybe it is because I have them cold turkey.

The nature of what they are withholding on Ferrie makes it unlikely they will deliver once I file, as they have on other matters. Some of it relates to your much-troubled client. Because they kept it from the Warren Commission, I think they are not anxious for anybody to know what it says. I do not. But I do know this: they were investigating Ferrie two weeks before the JFK assassination. This coincides with his work for Gill. Perfectly. And I think I have them on the law, too. When I say I know they were investigating Ferrie, I mean I have the documentary proof in my possession. This makes me think maybe you do not merely have to allege he was important to your client. Maybe they prove it for you?

I have gotten some of what they are withholding, but it doesn't relate to his work for Gill. And it does not meet the qualification given for withholding, either. But, then, I could write a book titled, "The Department of Justice and the FBI Never Tell the Truth", with a long appendix of lying FBI reports and letters from lawyers.

I also believe they have engaged in some public-relations work against your client in Washington in the recent past, but I've not tried to prove they are responsible. I do know the nationwide story came from there.

Should any of this interest you, let me know. I assume my phone is not the private line I pay for. However, I am in Washington, which is but an hour away, just about every week. Should have told you: Regis Kennedy filed a real cute report I have, saying he was in attendance at the trial 11/22/63 and not mentioning Ferrie was with him. It seems they were not investigating Ferrie in that one. Catch? However, when the Giant got interested in Ferrie, he and Regis had an old home week over it. Ferrie spoke rather freely - I'd say joyously - about it. I have the unpublished copy of a N.O. reporter on that one.

Best regards,